

**Remarks**

The Office action mailed on March 14, 2012 has been reviewed. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the detailed comments.

The Examiner's Office action mailed March 14, 2012, which allowed claim 102, objected to claims 18 and 20, and rejected pending claims 1-58, 60-102 and 107-134 has been reviewed. In view of the following amendments, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-58, 60-102 and 107-134 under 35 USC § 102 as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,385,596 to Wiser ("Wiser"). The Examiner found that Wiser does not teach the state change claims in claims 18 and 20. The Examiner found that, with regard to claims 102, the prior art was not found to anticipate or make obvious the claimed switch controller in the context of claim 102.

Certain independent claims have been amended, and the amended claims are believed to be patentable.

With regard to claim 45, Wiser does not disclose, teach, or suggest a stream caster to create at least one information block for a session, wherein the information block comprises the reservation identification, an identification of streamed media, and at least one member of a group consisting of a presentation identification, a media server identification, a stream caster identification, a media player identification, and a data packet path identification. Column 8, lines 18-41 indicate that various items may exist system wide, but it does not teach that an information block specifically is created for a session with the claimed items.

Because the independent claims are believed patentable, it is not necessary to discuss patentable limitations of claims depending there from, the reference, or the rejections. The lack of a discussion of patentable limitations of those dependent claims should not be construed to mean that there are not patentable limitations in those dependent claims.

Further, all reasons for patentability of the independent and dependent claims have not necessarily been discussed herein. No implication or construction should be made therefore.

Applicant has no further remarks with regard to any references cited by the Examiner and made of record, whether or not acted upon by the Examiner in the action's rejections, even if specifically identified in the action or any other paper or written or verbal communication. No

implication or construction should be drawn about any review of the same by Applicant or Applicant's attorney.

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that the Applicant's invention as defined by the claims is patentable over the references of record Issuance of a Notice of Allowance is solicited.

Applicant's attorney welcomes the opportunity to discuss the case with the Examiner in the event that there are any questions or comments regarding the response or the application.

This is intended to be a complete response to the Examiner's Office action mailed on March 14, 2012.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required or credit any overpayment to USPTO Deposit Account 50-1662, referencing the docket number above.

Respectfully Submitted,

Polsinelli Shughart PC

By /James M. Stipek/

James M. Stipek, Reg. No 39,388  
Polsinelli Shughart PC  
700 W. 47<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 1000  
Kansas City, MO 64112  
Tel: (816) 360-4191  
Fax: (816) 753-1536  
Attorney for Applicant(s)